



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/004,349	11/02/2001	Mark F. Wahl	13220.007001; P5842	3784
32615	7590	02/21/2006	EXAMINER	
OSHA LIANG L.L.P./SUN 1221 MCKINNEY, SUITE 2800 HOUSTON, TX 77010			SIDDIQI, MOHAMMAD A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2154	

DATE MAILED: 02/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/004,349	WAHL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mohammad A. Siddiqi	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 October 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 13-21 and 23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-12 and 22 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 13-21 and 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/22/2005</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-23 are presented for examination. Claims 1-12 and 22 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claim 23 is new. Claims 13-21 and 23 are examined.
2. Claims 1-12 and 22 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 10/21/2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 13-21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters et al. (6,377,950) (hereinafter Peters) in view of Ambrosini et al. (6,609,121) (hereinafter Ambrosini).

5. As per claim 13, Peters discloses a computer system to manage a directory server, comprising: a processor (116, fig 1, col 2, lines 25-61); a memory (116, fig 1, col 2, lines 25-61); and software instructions stored in the memory for enabling the computer system under control of the processor (116, fig 1, col 2, lines 25-61), to perform:

receiving a Lightweight Directory Access Protocol request from a client computer to a front-end portion (116, fig 1);

processing the Lightweight Directory Access Protocol request to create a front-end call (116, 120, fig 1, col 3, lines 38-41);

sending the front-end call to a back-end portion (118, fig, col 3, lines 39-45);

processing the front-end call using a default database function to produce a result (116, fig 1, col 1, lines 36-47; col 3, lines 45-59), wherein the default database function comprises a mapping tree (Directories are organized in an object-oriented and hierarchical way; Information about a real-world object is stored in the entry that represents this object in the directory; To mirror the relationships of their respective objects, entries are organized in a tree structure, col 1, lines 29-37) portion to identify a location of information stored in the back-end (performing full import from the directory server, 118, fig 1, col 6, lines 49-64 portion in response to the Lightweight Directory

Access Protocol request sent by the client computer (116, 118, fig 1, col 1, lines 36-47; col 3, lines 38-59, col 6, lines 50-64),

wherein the back-end portion comprises a plurality of back-end plug-ins for database management (add-ins or plug-ins are Software modules that add specific features or services to a larger program or system, col 4, lines 61-67);

passing the result to the front-end portion (fig 3, col 5, lines 3-13); and

sending the result from the front-end portion to the client computer (fig 3, col 5, lines 3-13; col 4, line 61 discussion contd. col 5).

While Peters discloses the system substantially as claimed, Peters does not disclose the terms tree, mapping, and plug-ins. Nonetheless, tree, mapping tree, and backend plug-ins known term in the directory services art as evidenced by Ambrosini. In similar art, Ambrosini discloses directory assistance system can map the data contained in the DA system into an LDAP schema tree-like structure (col 8, lines 33-44); LDAP provides plug-in architecture which permits a third party provider to integrate services into an LDAO server. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Peters and Ambrosini. The motivation would have been developing Integrated

Directory Services System which automatically propagates the changes to the other database to maintain the consistency and integrity of the data.

6. As per claim 14, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 13, above.

7. As per claim 15, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 14, above. In addition, Peters discloses managing communication by the front-end portion between server-side software and a directory client program stored on the client computer (116, fig 1, see discussion, col 6, lines 65-67, cont. col 7).

8. As per claim 16, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 14, above. In addition, Peters discloses managing the directory server system using a graphical user interface backed by an administrative server (118, fig 1, central administration point, col 3, lines 7-11).

9. As per claim 17, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 14, above. In addition, Ambrosini discloses accessing and querying the back-end portion from a web browser (48, fig 2) with a gateway (communication network, 10, fig 3).

10. As per claim 18, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 14, above. In addition, Peters discloses manipulating the front-end portion and the back-end portion with a plurality of database command line tools (elements of fig 8, col 17, lines 45-67).

11. As per claim 19, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 14, above. In addition, Peters discloses reporting activity to a network console workstation by a network management protocol monitor (see discussion, col 11, line 5).

12. As per claim 20, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 14, above. In addition, Peters discloses reporting activity (fig 8) to a network console workstation by a network management protocol monitor (see discussion, col 11, line 5).

13. As per claim 21, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 14, above.

14. As per claim 23, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 13, above. In addition, Peters discloses wherein the core component

connection responder is configured to perform at least one selected from the group consisting of roles and class of service (see discussion, col 13, line 6).

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

U.S. Patent 6,587,874 teaches automatically configuring network devices using LDAP protocol.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad A. Siddiqi whose telephone number is (571) 272-3976. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MAS



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100